



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,397	07/14/2003	Max E. Ramey	40217.0001USC1	7673

7590 01/08/2004

Thomas H. Young
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

KRECK, JOHN J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3673

DATE MAILED: 01/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/619,397

Applicant(s)

RAMEY ET AL.

Examiner

John Kreck

Art Unit

3673

All Participants:

(1) John Kreck.

(2) Thomas Young.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 December 2003

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

US 6,609,761 (parent case)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner stated that a double patenting rejection would be made over the parent case. Claim 1 in the patent includes substantially all of the limitations of claim 1 in the instant application, but includes further steps related to above ground processing. The invention as called for claim 1 of the patent could not be practiced without infringing on claim 1 of the instant application; thus allowance would result in an undue extension of the right to exclude, Examiner suggested that a terminal disclaimer would place the application in condition for allowance. Examiner indicated that if a terminal disclaimer was not received in two weeks, a rejection would be mailed.